



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

that he was a man of high rank, as he had owned at least two slaves, one a bath rubber and the other a coachman.

But there is another Alexander living at this time, with whom we could more plausibly, I think, identify this character, namely the son of Demetrius Poliorcetes and Deidamia, the sister of Pyrrhus. While we have no information that the son of Lysimachus was ever in Egypt, the only mention in history of this son of Demetrius is in Plutarch, *Demetrius* 53, where he says: "He [Demetrius] had also, by Deidamia, a son Alexander, who lived and died in Egypt" (*ὃς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ κατεβίωσε*). Demetrius married Deidamia at Argos in 303 B.C., so as to seal his alliance with Pyrrhus against Cassander (Plut. *Demetr.* 25; *Pyr.* 4). Deidamia died while she was with Demetrius in Cilicia (Plut. *Demetr.* 32) some time between 300 and 298 (Niese, *Gesch. d. gr. und mak. Staaten*, I, 356), and so we can judge the age of her son Alexander within four years. The papyrus referred to above was probably written during the first years of Euergetes I, so that Alexander would have been between fifty and sixty years of age if he was still alive.

How was it that Alexander came to live and die in Egypt? Beloch (*Gr. Gesch.*, III, pp. 2, 91) has an ingenious explanation when he states, referring only to Plutarch's *Demetrius*, that Alexander was captured at Salamis in Cyprus by Ptolemy (*Demetr.* 35) and lived the rest of his life in Egypt. He has no basis for this explanation, for while Plutarch does state that the mother and children of Demetrius were besieged by Ptolemy in Salamis he also states a little later (*Demetr.* 38) that Ptolemy "had dismissed his [Demetrius'] mother and children, bestowing upon them presents and honors." It is not probable that Alexander went to Egypt at this time; we do not know when this occurred. The only time we know of, after the birth of Alexander, when Ptolemy and Demetrius were on friendly terms, was about 297, when Pyrrhus went to Egypt as a hostage for Demetrius (Bouché Leclercq, *Histoire des Lagides*, I, 82, n. 4; Plut. *Pyr.* 4). I would suggest that Alexander, though still a child, was taken along as a hostage, and that when Pyrrhus was given money and sent back to Epirus (Plut. *Pyr.* 5) he left his nephew as a hostage. However this may be, we do know that he lived and died in Egypt about the time this papyrus was written, and we can readily understand how, after the death of Ptolemy Soter, Philadelphus would be anxious to retain the half-brother of Antigonus Gonatas as a royal hostage.

EDWIN W. WEBSTER

#### THE CALLINUS OF PAUSANIAS ix. 9. 5

The evidence for the statement that Callinus of Ephesus regarded Homer as the poet of the *Thebais* has already been presented and discussed by me in *Classical Philology*, XVI, 20 ff., and by Professor Fitch in XVII, 37 ff.

A passage in Pausanias is the sole support for such statements as these: "Callinus who flourished about 690 B.C., believed Homer to be the author

of an epic called the *Thebais*" (Jebb, *Homer*, p. 85). "The earliest trace of Homer in literature is the reference to him in a lost poem of Callinus" (*ibid.*, p. 88).

If we have here the real truth it is the most important single sentence of literary criticism which has survived from ancient times, since it must prove that Homer was named as the poet of the *Thebais* more than two centuries before Herodotus mentioned his authorship of the *Iliad*, and Herodotus was the first to definitely name Homer as the poet of the *Iliad* and of the *Odyssey*.

In the passage in Pausanias (ix. 9. 5) all the manuscripts have Calaeus, while the form Callinus is the conjectural emendation made by Sylburg in the sixteenth century. It may be added that not only is Callinus an emendation, but the very word *Thebais* is a conjecture also and due to Hemsterhuys, since all the manuscripts have Θηβαίους. Hence both the poem in question and the name of the person quoted are merely conjectural emendations. Certainly but feeble support for such sweeping and important assertions!

Strange as it may seem the conjectural Callinus has met with but limited approval; Ruhnken could find no evidence for any literary discussions by the poet, Callinus, and therefore he rejected the suggestion as well as the manuscript reading and proposed the name of the poet, Callimachus; Immanuel Bekker in his edition of Pausanias adhered to the Vulgate reading, as did the Tauchnitz editor; while Sibelis in the great Weidmann edition discussed all these different conjectures and concluded that there was no argument to warrant changing the manuscripts, and he therefore kept Calaeus. Franckius accepted the reading Callinus but referred the name to an obscure philosopher rather than to the poet.

Nothing is gained by substituting an unknown Callinus for an unknown Calaeus, since the problem of identification still remains, even if the conjecture is accepted.

Pausanias could not have relied on the familiarity of his readers with a poet so little quoted as Callinus of Ephesus to such a degree that he would have introduced him with no explanatory phrase, as I have already argued in *The Unity of Homer*, p. 16.

There was a Callinus at that time whose name was so familiarly known that he needed no introduction and who could be referred to with no other means of identification than the mere mention of his name.

Lucian in his *Adversus Indoctum*, or *Admonitions to an Ignorant Collector of Books*, warns this ignorant enthusiast to consider well the real worth of those things which Callinus has made to seem so beautiful (chap. 2). Here Callinus is introduced with no indication of the person to whom reference is made, but whose name was clearly known to all. It is only later that we learn (chap. 24) that this Callinus is a crafty bookmaker who cannot be expected to give disinterested advice, and that financial ruin lies in following the suggestions of men of his sort.

We have here a Callinus at the time of Lucian and Pausanias, for they were contemporaries, who was so widely known that he needed no introductory phrases, and this Callinus was no ancient poet of Ephesus, but a living bookmaker, just the man to palm off a poem by Antimachus as if it were worthy of Homer.

It seems incredible that when Lucian wrote the name Callinus his readers should have immediately understood that a bookmaker of their own day was intended, but when Pausanias used that same name these same readers should have understood thereby the elegiac poet of Ephesus.

If we follow the manuscripts and prefer the form Caeleus or if we accept the conjectural Callinus we are in either case forced to the conclusion that Pausanias has not furnished the slightest evidence with which to support the theory that Homer was known as the author of the *Thebais* in the seventh century B.C.

JOHN A. SCOTT

#### NOTE ON LUCRETIUS 1. 80

In turning over the pages of that not entirely critical best seller, Professor James Harvey Robinson's *Mind in the Making*, I came upon Lucretius 1. 80 ff.

ne forte rearis  
impia te rationis inire elementa viamque  
indugredi sceleris

quoted to support the idea of an opposition between reason and religion in the translation "the fear of treading on the 'unholy grounds of reason and in the path of sin.'" The idea of the impiety of reason and its inferiority to sentiment is, as I believe Mill somewhere says, foreign to, or at least rare in, the philosophical ancients. I have always taken it for granted that *ratio* here means specifically the Epicurean or atomic philosophy and that *impia* is felt as a transferred epithet qualifying it. So I at first assumed that Professor Robinson's translation was merely another example of the well-known indifference of advanced thinkers to the facts of history and criticism which, as even the New Republic was constrained to point out, is exemplified elsewhere in his book. But on turning to Munro I find that Professor Robinson was quoting the Authorized Version so to speak. As it is plainly wrong in the impression it conveys if not in intent and as Munro does not comment on the point a correction seems worth while. I do not think that authority will be needed by anyone who re-reads the passage in the light of the context and of Lucretian and Latin usage. But instead of a laborious collection of parallel passages I will quote two or three of the